

# EXHIBIT 60

## I. Statement of Inquiry

Voter intimidation—threatening or coercing voters from participating in elections or selecting the candidate of their choice—has an unfortunate and long history in the United States. The best-known examples of voter intimidation come from the Jim Crow south as whites conspired to create a system of terror and laws that deterred African Americans from exercising their franchise.<sup>1</sup>

In more recent elections, voter intimidation has taken on subtler forms. Modern forms of voter intimidation include using online platforms and other mass communication technology to broadly disseminate information intended to confuse, frighten and threaten voters into staying away from the polls. For example, foreign countries, domestic groups, and individuals have exploited modern communication platforms—like social media and robocalling—to create confusion and distrust about the requirements for voting, and how potential voters' information would be used once they cast a ballot, and in some cases to spread false information about particular candidates. They have also used misinformation to sow fear about the legal consequences of voting. The Russian intelligence service, in particular, has mastered a particularly effective method of targeting misinformation to voters in an effort to suppress voter turnout. Their success has inspired others to mount similar disinformation campaigns.<sup>2</sup>

I was asked to analyze the August 22, 2020 robocall from Jack Burkman and Jacob Wohl to determine whether they included the kind of disinformation commonly used to confuse and intimidate voters. I reviewed that robocall and two others placed by Burkman and Wohl, in addition to a prospectus by their political advocacy group, the Arlington Center for Political Intelligence, and emails exchanged between Wohl and Burkman concerning the August 22 robocall. Based on my review, I reached the following three findings:

- a. Burkman and Wohl explicitly sought to mimic the successful voter intimidation campaign carried out by the Russian government in 2016. Like the Russians, Wohl and Burkman spread falsehoods about the dangers of voting primarily to Black voters. Burkman and Wohl's campaign shared other salient features with the Russian disinformation campaign, including by inventing a fake "civil rights" organization purporting to help voters—while in reality misleading them and suppressing their votes.
- b. Like similar disinformation campaigns, Wohl and Burkman's August 2020 robocall could have the effect of reducing voter turnout, deterring voters from using mail-in ballots, and spreading anti-Black stereotypes. The effect of these robocalls could plausibly cause confusion among voters and create a reluctance to vote out of concern about how their information would be used once voting.

---

<sup>1</sup> Keele, Luke, William Cubbison, and Ismail White. "Suppressing Black votes: A historical case study of voting restrictions in Louisiana." *American Political Science Review* 115.2 (2021): 694-700.

<sup>2</sup> See Robert S. Mueller III, *Report on the Investigation into Russian Interference in the 2016 Presidential Election* (2019) (Mueller Report).

- c. The type of disinformation included in Wohl and Burkman's August 2020 robocall degrades the quality of our democracy by undermining voter confidence in the safety and legitimacy of voting and the ultimate result of an election. Recent research shows that messages that attack the validity of election results undermines trust in the electoral process.<sup>3</sup> Worse yet, this work shows that the effect on trust in electoral institutions is difficult to counteract and therefore could endure well beyond one particular election cycle.<sup>4</sup>

### III. Qualifications

I am a Professor of Political Science at Stanford University in Stanford, California. I also hold the titles of Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution and Co-Director of the Democracy and Polarization Lab. I first joined the Stanford Faculty in 2010 as an Assistant Professor. I was promoted to Associate Professor in 2014, and I held a courtesy appointment in the department of Computer Science from 2016–2017. From 2017–2018, I was an Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science and the College at the University of Chicago. I received my Ph.D. in Political Science from Harvard University in 2010.

My research evaluates political representation and democratic practices in American politics and throughout the world. To do this I develop and deploy new statistical, machine learning, and data science techniques. Recently, I have published research on how individuals use the internet to learn about political campaigns and how confusion over electoral rules deters individuals from turning out to vote, including the consequences of voter identification laws and voters' information about those laws. I have also published papers on legislative institutions, election administration, political representation, and statistical methods. I am the author of three books and my research and writing has been published in *American Political Science Review*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *Journal of Politics*, *Political Analysis*, the *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, the *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, and several other journals.

My CV is attached to this Declaration, which includes a complete list of all publications I have authored in the past 10 years. In the past four years, I have been an expert witness in one other case: *Vote Forward v. Dejoy*, No. 20-cv-2405 (D.D.C. 2020). I am being compensated at a rate of \$400 an hour.

### IV. Russian Voter Intimidation Efforts in the 2016 Election

Wohl and Burkman have explicitly admitted their intention to replicate the Russian's strategy deployed in the 2016 election using the Internet Research Agency (IRA). On page 3 of

---

<sup>3</sup> Clayton, Katherine et al. "Elite Rhetoric Can Undermine Democratic Norms" *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2021. 118 (23)

<sup>4</sup> Berlinski, Nicolas et al. "The Effects of Unsubstantiated Claims of Voter Fraud on Confidence in Elections" 2021. *Forthcoming*.

the prospectus for the Arlington Center for Political Intelligence, Burkman and Wohl wrote “As the Russian Internet Research Agency proved in 2016, building up leftwing internet properties that aim to ultimately suppress turnout is an effective strategy.” Burkman and Wohl go on to state their goal is to, “Build up left-wing online properties with large following, only to have those properties direct followers to NOT vote come election day.” Given this stated goal, I will first review how the IRA used social media platforms to target Black citizens for intimidation, to undermine their trust in elections, and to harass voters in the 2016 election.

To suppress Black votes, long before the election the IRA created pages and channels on social media platforms targeting Black voters. This involved the IRA creating accounts on social media platforms like Facebook and Twitter that intentionally mimicked accounts associated with the Black Lives Matter political movement, along with YouTube content. For example, the IRA created an account called “blacktivist” on Facebook and Twitter, an account name blending “Black” and activist. The account initially posted a wide range of content that was intended to appeal to African American activists, such as statements denouncing police brutality and arguments against mass incarceration.<sup>5</sup>

After building a following during the primary elections, the IRA then shifted the content of the groups to make arguments to intimidate or otherwise suppress Black votes.<sup>6</sup> University of Wisconsin Professor Young Mie Kim argued that the IRA attempted to suppress Black votes using a three-pronged strategy: “a) turnout suppression/election boycott; b) third-candidate promotion; and c) candidate attack, all targeting nonwhites or likely Clinton voters.”<sup>7</sup>

Some of the attacks from the IRA blended these strategies. For example, Professor Young Mie Kim identified an ad from an IRA backed page called “Williams & Calvin” that argued “We don’t have any other choice this time but boycott the election. This time we choose between two racists. No one represents Black people. Don’t go to vote.”<sup>8</sup> This ad attacks Hillary Clinton—the heavily preferred candidate among Black voters—and then argues that because she is racist, those voters should stay home.

### **Opinion One: Burkman and Wohl Explicitly Mimicked the 2016 Election IRA Strategy**

Following their stated goal, Burkman and Wohl’s robocalls explicitly mimicked most of the IRA strategies described above. First, they specifically targeted Black voters in their robocalls, mirroring the IRA’s 2016 strategy of targeting Black voters in order to suppress Democratic votes. To assess where Burkman and Wohl intended to target their robocall, I examined the emails between Burkman and Wohl. Based on these emails, it is clear Burkman

---

<sup>5</sup> See Mueller Report; United States Senate, Report of the Select Committee on Intelligence on Russian Active Measures Campaigns and Interference in the 2016 U.S. Election (2016).

<sup>6</sup> <https://demtech.oii.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/93/2018/12/Appendices-for-The-IRA-Social-Media-and-Political-Polarization.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> [https://journalism.wisc.edu/wp-content/blogs.dir/41/files/2018/09/Uncover.Kim\\_v.5.0905181.pdf](https://journalism.wisc.edu/wp-content/blogs.dir/41/files/2018/09/Uncover.Kim_v.5.0905181.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> [https://journalism.wisc.edu/wp-content/blogs.dir/41/files/2018/09/Uncover.Kim\\_v.5.0905181.pdf](https://journalism.wisc.edu/wp-content/blogs.dir/41/files/2018/09/Uncover.Kim_v.5.0905181.pdf)

and Wohl targeted their robocalls at Black neighborhoods. For example on August 25, 2020, Jacob Wohl wrote “We should send it to black neighborhoods in Milwaukee, Detroit, Philadelphia, Charlotte, Richmond, Atlanta, and Cleveland.” Jack Burkman then replied with other cities with a large Black population, writing “Cleveland, Phila, Minn, Chicago, NYC, Detroit.”

Burkman and Wohl’s reactions to the robocalls further revealed their intent to harass and intimidate Black voters. After the robocall were disseminated, Burkman and Wohl commented on the call backs they were receiving, writing, “I love these robocalls getting angry black call backs.” This is a clear statement that the intent was to harass Black people and ultimately coerce them to not participate in the 2020 election.

Burkman and Wohl also copied the IRA’s strategy of creating fake Black Lives Matter personas and evoking police brutality through their choice of the name “Tamika Taylor” in their robocall. In one robocall that I detail below, Burkman and Wohl spread disinformation about how the information from mail-in ballots could be used by government officials and private actors. Similar to the IRA creating accounts that mimic Black Lives Matters pages, Burkman and Wohl attempted to create the impression that the speaker in the robocall was an important figure in the Black Lives Matter movement. The robocall begins with the speaker identifying herself as “Tamika Taylor”, apparently in an attempt to give the impression that the call came from Breanna Taylor’s mother. Burkman and Wohl attempted to create this impression because Breanna Taylor’s murder has become a salient example of police brutality cited by Black Lives Matter and referenced in protests, and Breanna Taylor’s mother, Tamika, was a vocal advocate for the movement in the wake of her daughter’s death.<sup>9</sup> There is strong experimental evidence that messages from trusted sources have a larger effect on behavior than messages in general. By using the name Tamika Taylor, Wohl and Burkman tried to create the false impression that this robocall came from a trustworthy source.<sup>10</sup> While attempting to make this deception Wohl and Burkman actually made an error: Breanna Taylor’s mother’s real name is Tamika Palmer. But the intent remains: to disguise the source of the message to increase its potency.

Finally, Burkman and Wohl sent out a robocall that encouraged recipients to boycott the election. In this call Burkman and Wohl alleged that Joe Biden used a racial slur to refer to African Americans. The purpose of this call was to dampen support for Joe Biden, which was strategically advantageous to Donald Trump’s candidacy. Learning that a candidate uses offensive terms to refer to a group would cause some people, especially people in that group, to no longer vote for the candidate. The Russians deployed a nearly identical strategy during the 2016 election. In social media posts and YouTube videos the Russians alleged that Hillary Clinton had supported policies that were harmful for African Americans. For example, in the 2016 election the IRA alleged that Hillary Clinton received donations from the Ku Klux Klan.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Police shot and killed Breanna Taylor in her home after serving a warrant at the wrong address

<sup>10</sup> Kuklinski, James H., and Norman L. Hurley. "On hearing and interpreting political messages: A cautionary tale of citizen cue-taking." *The Journal of Politics* 56.3 (1994): 729-751.

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/dec/17/russian-propagandists-targeted-african-americans-2016-election>

This robocall further supports a conclusion that the August 22 robocall, which followed the Biden robocall, was part of a broader strategy inspired by Russia's 2016 disinformation campaign.

**Opinion Two: Wohl and Burkman's robocall included the kind of disinformation likely to deter voter turnout**

During the 2020 election, vote by mail protected voters who were concerned about exposure to COVID-19 while voting in person. Governments across the country, including the State of New York, advocated mail-in voting as a safe alternative to in-person voting due to the pandemic.<sup>12</sup> Evidence from the 2020 election shows that, nationwide, about 38% of Black voters cast their ballot by mail.<sup>13</sup>

According to the prospectus and emails, Burkman and Wohl's overall goal was to create confusion about using vote by mail and ultimately deter Black voters from participating in the election. This tactic of creating confusion mimics the IRA's efforts to suppress Black votes in 2016. Moreover, there is ample evidence that creating confusion deters voting, while reducing confusion increases voting.<sup>14</sup> For example, in North Carolina, voters' confusion about what was required to vote caused a decrease in turnout in a general election.<sup>15</sup>

The robocall used Russian-style disinformation to increase confusion about voting by mail and spread falsehoods designed to deter voters from turning out.

First, the robocall falsely claimed that information from mail-in voting could be used to execute old warrants. I have seen no evidence that voting by mail exposes individuals to increased police attention. The State of New York's Board of Elections has explicitly claimed that such information is not used to execute old warrants. But this false claim could confuse and deter individuals from voting. There is evidence that individuals with prior interactions with the criminal justice system are often confused about whether they are eligible to vote, what is required to vote, and the potentially negative consequences of voting.<sup>16</sup> Further, randomized experiments show that providing prior felons with information that they are eligible to vote causes an increase in electoral participation.<sup>17</sup> Spreading disinformation that vote by mail can be used to serve old warrants will likely counteract the positive impact of accurate information

---

<sup>12</sup> Thompson, Daniel M., et al. "Universal vote-by-mail has no impact on partisan turnout or vote share." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117.25 (2020): 14052-14056.

<sup>13</sup> Pew Research "The Voting Experience in 2020" <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2020/11/20/the-voting-experience-in-2020/>

<sup>14</sup> Hopkins, Daniel J., et al. "Results from a 2020 field experiment encouraging voting by mail." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118.4 (2021).

<sup>15</sup> Grimmer, Justin, and Jesse Yoder. "The durable differential deterrent effects of strict photo identification laws." *Political Science Research and Methods* (2021): 1-17.

<sup>16</sup> Meredith, Marc, and Michael Morse. "The politics of the restoration of ex-felon voting rights: The case of Iowa." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 10 (2015): 41-100.

<sup>17</sup> Gerber, Alan S., et al. "Can incarcerated felons be (Re) integrated into the political system? Results from a field experiment." *American Journal of Political Science* 59.4 (2015): 912-926.

about felon voting rights by confusing voters, and even cause individuals already uncertain about participation to not cast their vote. Several states where the robocall was placed, including Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, and New York, allow ex-felons to vote, and the confusion wrought by the robocall could reasonably be expected to impact those voters.

Second, the robocall also makes the false claim that credit card companies will use the information collected from mail in ballots to collect outstanding debt. Again, I have seen no evidence that voting by mail increases an individual's risk of credit card collections. The State of New York's Board of Elections has explicitly claimed that it does not provide vote-by-mail information to creditors in the way implied by the call. But this information is likely to confuse and deter voters who have credit card debt. Again, the motivation for this information is a racist stereotype that African Americans are negligent in paying debts. But it also implies that voting by mail will enable aggressive debt collectors—disinformation likely to confuse and deter voting.

Third, the robocall contains false claims about how information from vote by mail would be used by the CDC for mandatory vaccinations. Again, I have seen no evidence that this claim is true. The State of New York's Board of Elections has explicitly stated that New York voting records are not given to the CDC. This claim mirrors the racially charged false claims used by the IRA in 2016. While polling data shows that African Americans are supportive of vaccines overall, the vaccination rates in African American communities lagged behind other racial groups around the time of the election.<sup>18</sup> In part, this skepticism is due to a series of horrific medical experiments like the Tuskegee experiment where some participants were allowed to continue to suffer from syphilis.<sup>19</sup> Evoking forced vaccinations not only is a reminder of this painful history, it also is intended to coerce Black citizens to not cast their ballots using mail voting.

### **Opinion Three: The disinformation in Wohl and Burkman's robocall degrades the quality of democracy in the U.S.**

The disinformation in Wohl and Burkman's robocalls are corrosive to US democracy. Representative democracy requires citizens to trust that their elected representatives reflect the preferences of citizens. Skepticism about electoral institutions undermines this essential trust. If citizens perceive their elected officials to be illegitimate, those citizens have reason to be skeptical of the policies their officials enact and ultimately may begin to be skeptical that power should be transferred at all.

Research shows that messages similar to the content of Wohl and Burkman's robocalls increase doubt in electoral institutions and mistrust in election results. Across studies, experimentally exposing citizens to election-skeptical messages increases doubt about election administration in the US and fosters mistrust in the election results.<sup>20</sup> What's more, evidence

---

<sup>18</sup> Padamsee, Tasleem J., et al. "Changes in COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy Among Black and White Individuals in the US." *JAMA Network Open* 5.1 (2022): e2144470-e2144470.

<sup>19</sup> Moore, Justin Xavier, et al. "Correlates of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among a community sample of African Americans living in the Southern United States." *Vaccines* 9.8 (2021): 879.

<sup>20</sup> Clayton, Katherine et al. "Elite Rhetoric Can Undermine Democratic Norms" *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2021. 118 (23)



shows that once trust is lost, it is difficult to restore. Similar studies show that corrective information from trusted news sources does little to repair the damage the election-skeptical messages have done.<sup>21</sup>

The corrosive effects of Wohl and Burkman's robocalls are both immediate and potentially long-lasting. Repairing the damage from these disinformation campaigns will require substantial effort, if repair is possible at all.

## **VI. Conclusion.**

In this assessment of the August 20 robocall, I have concluded that Wohl and Burkman mimicked key aspects of the Russian IRA's successful 2016 disinformation campaign and that the type of disinformation the robocall conveyed was likely to confuse voters and deter them from voting.

/s/ Justin Grimmer

---

<sup>21</sup> Berlinski, Nicolas et al. "The Effects of Unsubstantiated Claims of Voter Fraud on Confidence in Elections" 2021. *Forthcoming*.



# JUSTIN GRIMMER

---

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| CONTACT<br>INFORMATION | <p>Department of Political Science<br/>Stanford University<br/>Encina Hall West<br/>616 Jane Stanford Way<br/>Stanford, CA 94305<br/>Office: 212</p> <p><i>Voice:</i> (617) 710-6803<br/><i>email:</i> jgrimmer@stanford.edu</p>  |
| EMPLOYMENT             | <p><b>Stanford University</b><br/>Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science. 2010-2014.<br/>Associate Professor, Department of Political Science. 2014 - 2017. 2018.<br/>Associate Professor (by courtesy), Department of Computer Science. 2016-2017.<br/>Professor, Department of Political Science. 2018 - Present</p> <p><b>Hoover Institution</b><br/>Senior Fellow. 2018-present</p> <p><b>University of Chicago</b><br/>Associate Professor, Department of Political Science and the College. 2017-2018.</p>  |
| EDUCATION              | <p><b>Harvard University</b> <i>Department of Government</i><br/>Ph.D Political Science, 2010<br/>A.M. Political Science, 2009</p> <p><b>Wabash College,</b><br/>A.B. Mathematics and Political Science 2005<br/><i>Summa cum laude</i>, Distinction in Mathematics and Political Science Comprehensive Exams</p>   |
| BOOKS                  | <p>Representational Style in Congress: What Legislators Say and Why It Matters. <i>Cambridge University Press</i>, 2013.</p> <p>The Impression of Influence: Legislator Communication, Representation, and Democratic Accountability. With Sean Westwood and Solomon Messing. <i>Princeton University Press</i>. 2014.</p> <p>Text as Data: A New Framework for Machine Learning and the Social Sciences. With Margaret E Roberts and Brandon Stewart. <i>Princeton University Press</i>. 2022.</p>   |
| PUBLICATIONS           | <p>“Naïve regression requires weaker assumptions than factor models to adjust for multiple cause confounding” (with Dean Knox and Brandon Stewart) <i>Conditional Accept, Journal of Machine Learning Research</i></p> <p>“A Women’s Voice in the House: Gender Composition and Its Consequences in Committee Hearings”. with Pamela Ban, Jaclyn Kaslovsky, and Emily West <i>Forthcoming, Quarterly Journal of Political Science</i></p> <p>“Causal Inference with Latent Variables” with Christian Fong. <i>Forthcoming, American Journal of Political Science</i>.</p> <p>“Partisan Enclaves and Information Bazaars: Mapping Selective Exposure to Online News” with Matt Tyler and Shanto Iyengar. <i>Forthcoming, Journal of Politics</i></p> |

“No Evidence for Systematic Voter Fraud: A Guide To Statistical Claims About the 2020 Election” (with Andrew C. Eggers and Haritz Garro) *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2021.

“Machine Learning for Social Science: An Agnostic Approach” with Margaret E. Roberts and Brandon Stewart. *Annual Review of Political Science*. 2021

“The Durable Differential Deterrent Effect of Strict Photo Identification Laws” with Jesse Yoder. *Political Science Research and Methods*. 2021.

“Political Cultures”. with Lisa Blaydes. *Political Science Research and Methods*. 2020.

“Obstacles to Estimating Voter ID Laws’ Effect on Turnout”. with Eitan Hersh, Marc Meredith, Jonathan Mummolo, and Clayton Nall. *Journal of Politics*. 2018. 80 (3).

“Mirrors for Princes and Sultans: Advice on the Art of Governance in the Medieval Christian and Islamic Worlds” with Lisa Blaydes and Alison McQueen. *Journal of Politics*. 2018. 80 (4).

“Estimating Heterogeneous Treatment Effects and the Effects of Heterogeneous Treatments with Ensemble Methods” with Solomon Messing and Sean J. Westwood. *Political Analysis* 2017. 25(4). 413-434.

“Discovery of Treatments from Text Corpora” with Christian Fong. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (ACL 2016) Berlin, Germany

“Money in Exile: Campaign Contributions and Committee Access” with Eleanor Neff Powell. *Journal of Politics*. 2016. 78(4). 974-988.

“Measuring Representational Style in the House: The Tea Party, Obama, and Legislators’ Changing Expressed Priorities” in *Data Analytics in Social Science, Government, and Industry* Edited Volume from Cambridge University Press. 2016.

“TopicCheck: Interactive Alignment for Assessing Topic Model Stability” *North America Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL HLT)*. Jason Chuang, Molly Roberts, Brandon Stewart, Rebecca Weiss, Dustin Tingley, Justin Grimmer, and Jeffrey Heer. 2015.

“We’re All Social Scientists Now: How Big Data, Machine Learning, and Causal Inference Work Together” Part of Symposium on “Formal Theory, Causal Inference, and Big Data” *PS: Political Science & Politics* , 2015. 48(1), 80-83

“Computer-Assisted Content Analysis: Topic Models for Exploring Multiple Subjective Interpretations.” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems Workshop on Human-Propelled Machine Learning*. Jason Chuang, John D. Wilkerson, Rebecca Weiss, Dustin Tingley, Brandon M. Stewart, Margaret E. Roberts, Forough Poursabzi-Sagdeh, Justin Grimmer, Leah Findlater, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Jeffrey Heer. 2014.

“Congressmen in Exile: The Politics and Consequences of Involuntary Committee Removal” with Eleanor Neff Powell. *The Journal of Politics*, 2013. 75 (4), 907–920

“Appropriators not Position Takers: The Distorting Effects of Electoral Incentives on Congressional Representation”. *American Journal of Political Science*, 2013. 57 (3), 624–642.

“Text as Data: The Promise and Pitfalls of Automatic Content Analysis Methods for Political Documents” with Brandon Stewart. *Political Analysis*, 2013. 21 (3), 267–297.

“Evaluating Model Performance in Fictitious Prediction Problems”. Discussion of “Multinomial Inverse Regression for Text Analysis” by Matthew Taddy. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 2013.108 (503) 770-771

“Elevated Threat-Levels and Decreased Expectations: How Democracy Handles Terrorist Threats” with Tabitha Bonilla. *Poetics*, 2013. 41, 650-669.

- Special issue on topic models in the social sciences

“How Words and Money Cultivate a Personal Vote: The Effect of Legislator Credit Claiming on Constituent Credit Allocation” with Solomon Messing and Sean Westwood. *American Political Science Review*, 2012. 106 (4), 703–719.

“General Purpose Computer-Assisted Clustering and Conceptualization” with Gary King. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2011. 108 (7), 2643-2650.

“An Introduction to Bayesian Inference Via Variational Approximations” *Political Analysis*, 2011. 19(1), 32–47.

- Included in *Political Analysis* virtual issue on Big Data in Political Science

“Approval Regulation and Endogenous Provision of Confidence: Theory and Analogies to Licensing, Safety, and Financial Regulation” with Daniel Carpenter and Eric Lomazoff. *Regulation and Governance*. 2010. 4(4) 383-407.

“A Bayesian Hierarchical Topic Model for Political Texts: Measuring Expressed Agendas in Senate Press Releases” *Political Analysis*, 2010. 18(1), 1–35.

- Included in *Political Analysis* virtual issue on Bayesian methods in Political Science

WORKING PAPERS “How to Make Causal Inferences Using Texts” with Naoki Egami, Christian Fong, Margeret E. Roberts, and Brandon Stewart *Revise and Resubmit*

“What Can We Learn About How Political Campaigns Activate Attitudes?” with Will Marble and Cole Tanigawa-Lau.

“American Support for Political Violence is Lower than Expected” with Sean Westwood, Clayton Nall, and Matt Tyler. *Revise and Resubmit*

“Causal Inference in Natural Language Processing: Estimation, Prediction, Interpretation, and Beyond”. with Amir Feder, Katherine A. Keith, Emaad Manzoor, Reid Pryzant, Dhanya Sridhar, Zach Wood Doughty, Jacob Eisenstein, Roi Reichart, Margaret E. Roberts, Brandon M. Stewart, Victor Veitch, Diyi Yang. *Revise and Resubmit*

“The Unreliability of Measures of Inter-coder Reliability, and What to do About it”. with Gary King and Chiara Superti.

“Estimating the Contribution of Voting Blocs to Candidate’s Victories” with Will Marble. *Invited to Resubmit*

“Potomac Fever or Constituent Ombudsman?: Testing Theory of Legislative Capacity and Priorities”. with Devin Judge-Lord and Eleanor Neff Powell. (Under Review).

“Assessing the Reliability of Probabilistic US Presidential Election Forecasts May Take Decades” with Dean Knox and Sean Westwood (Under Review).

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| REVIEWS AND<br>OTHER WRITING | <p>Review of <i>Cyberwar: How Russian Hackers and Trolls Helped Elect a President</i> Public Opinion Quarterly. 2019. 83, 1.</p> <p>“Dismantling Trump’s Election Fraud Claims”. Washington Times, February 8, 2021. with Andrew B. Hall</p> <p>“In the voter fraud debate, be wary of junk science”. The Hill, August 27, 2021. with Andrew B. Hall and Daniel Thompson</p>   |
| <b>Public<br/>Engagement</b> | <p>“Strengthening the Integrity of Presidential Elections” American Enterprise Institute Panel. June, 2021. <a href="https://www.c-span.org/video/?512799-1/strengthening-integrity-presidential-elections">https://www.c-span.org/video/?512799-1/strengthening-integrity-presidential-elections</a></p>  |
| HONORS AND<br>AWARDS         | <p>2018. Wabash College Jeremy R. Wright Young Alumnus Distinguished Service Award</p> <p>2015. Political Methodology section emerging scholar award. Awarded to a young researcher, within ten years of their degree, who is making notable contributions to the field of political methodology.</p> <p>2015. School of Humanities and Sciences Dean’s award for achievement in teaching.</p> <p>2014. The Richard F. Fenno, Jr. Prize. Awarded to the best book in legislative studies published in 2013.</p> <p>2013. <i>Political Analysis</i> Editor’s Choice Award for an article providing an especially significant contribution to political methodology.</p> <p>2012. School of Humanities and Sciences Dean’s award for achievement in the first years of teaching at Stanford.</p> <p>2011. Warren Miller Prize. Awarded for the best paper published in <i>Political Analysis</i> in 2010.</p> <p>2010. Senator Charles Sumner Prize. Awarded by the Harvard Government faculty for the best dissertation from the legal, political, historical, economic, social, or ethnic approach, dealing with any means or measures tending toward the prevention of war and the establishment of universal peace.</p> <p>2010. Robert H. Durr award, for the best paper presented at the 2009 Midwest Political Science Association meeting applying quantitative methods to a substantive problem.</p> <p>2010. Certificate of Distinction in Teaching, Gov 2010: Qualitative and Quantitative Research Design.</p> <p>2008. John T. Williams Prize. Awarded by the Society for Political Methodology for best dissertation proposal.</p> <p>2005. Phi Beta Kappa, Wabash College.</p> <p>2005. John Maurice Butler Prize. Awarded to the senior who, by vote of the Wabash College faculty, has highest achievements in scholarship and character.</p> <p>2005. N. Ryan Shaw II Political Science Award. Awarded to the outstanding senior political science major.</p> <p>2005. George E. Cascallen Prize in Mathematics. Awarded to the outstanding senior Mathematics</p> |

major.

FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS 2013-2016. Stanford University Victoria Schuck Faculty Scholar in the School of Humanities and Sciences.

2013-2014. Stanford University, United Parcel Service Endowment Fund Grant, “Infrastructure Spending in American Cities”.

2013-2014. National Fellow, Hoover Institute.

2012-2013. Faculty Fellow, Institute for Research in the Social Sciences.

2011-2013. Visiting Fellow, Hoover Institute.

2010. Dirksen Center Congressional research award, for “It’s the Flow Not the Stock: Congressional Staff and Their Influence on Policy Outcomes” (with Matt Blackwell).

2009-2010. Center for American Political Studies (CAPS) dissertation completion fellowship.

2009. Eliot Dissertation Completion Grant. A competitive, merit-based Graduate School of Arts and Sciences fellowship for the Social Sciences (declined).

2008-2009. CAPS dissertation research fellowship.

2005-2006. National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship, Honorable Mention.

SOFTWARE AND PATENTS **Patent Number: US 8,438,162 B2** Method and Apparatus for Selecting Clusterings to Classify a Predetermined Data Set (with Gary King)

**Patent Number: US 9,519,705 B2** Method and Apparatus for Selecting Clusterings to Classify a Data Set. (with Gary King)

**Consilience: Software for Understanding Large Volumes of Unstructure Text** (with Merce Crosas, Gary King and Brandon Stewart) (consilience.com).

Implements a general purpose methodology to facilitate discovery in large collections of texts

**textEffect (CRAN)**

Implements text as intervention method introduced in Fong and Grimmer (2016).

**“arima: ARIMA time series models”** in Kosuke Imai, Gary King, and Olivia Lau “Zelig: Everyone’s Statistical Software”. 2006.

INVITED PRESENTATIONS AND WORKSHOPS (LAST 3 YEARS) Department of Political Science. Northwestern University. 2018.  
Methods Workshop. Northwestern University. 2018.  
Methods Workshop. Department of Political Science. Yale University. 2018.  
Methods Workshop. Department of Political Science. Texas A&M University. 2018.  
MIDAS Interdisciplinary Seminar Series. University of Michigan. 2019.  
American Politics Workshop. Department of Political Science. UC Berkeley. 2019.  
American Politics Workshop. Department of Political Science. New York University. 2019.  
Summer Institute in Computational Social Science. Princeton University. 2019.  
Empirical Implementations of Theoretical Models. Emory University. 2019.  
Southern California Methods Workshop. UC Riverside. 2019.  
Data Science Institute. Columbia University. 2019.

Department of Politics and CSDP. Princeton University. 2019.  
 Text as Data Workshop. US Census Bureau. 2019.  
 TextXD Keynote Address. UC Berkeley. 2019.  
 Department of Political Science. University of North Carolina. 2020.  
 Institute for Advanced Study. Princeton University. 2020  
 Duke Law School. 2020.  
 International Methods Colloquim. 2021.  
 MIT Election Administration Workshop. 2021. Princeton Elections Workshop. 2021.  
 Chicago Committee of Quantitative Methods. 2021.

PROFESSIONAL AND  
 DEPARTMENTAL  
 SERVICE

Reviewer for *American Political Science Review*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *Journal of Politics*, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *British Journal of Political Science*, *Political Analysis*, *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *Journal of Public Economics*, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, *Congress and the Presidency*, *Journal of Political Communication*, *Political Science Research and Methods*, *Research and Politics*, *American Politics Research*, *Political Behavior*, *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, *Journal of Information Science*, *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *National Science Foundation*, *Journal of Social Structure*, *Sociological Methodology*, *Cambridge University Press*, *Oxford University Press*, *Social Forces*, *Chapman & Hall (CRC Press)*, *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL HLT)*, *Association for Computational Linguistics Annual Conference (ACL)*, *Social Science Computer Review*, *Swiss National Science Foundation*

Interim President, Text as Data Society Member, Department Policy and Planning Committee (2015-2017, 2018-present) Member, Department DEI Committee (2020-2021)  
 Co-Director, Democracy and Polarization Lab. 2018-Present  
 Chair, Omnibus Faculty Search Committee. 2018  
 Organizer Text as Data. 2019. (TADA2019)  
 Editorial Board Member, *Political Analysis* (2014-2015)  
 Co-Editor, *Political Analysis Letters* (2014-2018)  
 Editorial Board Member, *Journal of Politics* (2015-Present)  
 Graduate Admissions Committee, 2010-2011  
 Omnibus Faculty Search Committee, 2011-2012  
 Award Committee, Warren Miller Prize, 2012-2013  
 Award Committee, Fenno Prize, 2014-2015  
 Methods Curriculum Committee, 2013-2014  
 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, 2013-2014, 2014-2015  
 Policy and Planning Committee, 2014-2016, 2018-Present  
 Director of Undergraduate Studies, 2015-2016.  
 Co-organizer: Stanford Conference on Computational Social Science. June 1st, 2012.  
 Section Chair for Legislative Campaigns and Elections. MPSA, 2013.  
 Program Committee: Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS), Computational Social Science Workshop, 2011, Topic Modeling Workshop 2013